

City of Glendale

*5850 West Glendale Avenue
Glendale, AZ 85301*



Meeting Minutes - Final

Friday, April 28, 2017

9:00 AM

Budget Workshop

Council Chambers

City Council Workshop

Mayor Jerry Weiers

Vice Mayor Ian Hugh

Councilmember Jamie Aldama

Councilmember Joyce Clark

Councilmember Ray Malnar

Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff

Councilmember Bart Turner

CALL TO ORDER**ROLL CALL**

- Present** 6 - Mayor Jerry Weiers, Vice Mayor Ian Hugh, Councilmember Jamie Aldama, Councilmember Joyce Clark, Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Bart Turner
- Absent** 1 - Councilmember Ray Malnar

[Councilmember Malnar arrived after the meeting had begun.]

Also present were Kevin Phelps, City Manager; Michael Bailey, City Attorney; and Julie K. Bower, City Clerk.

WORKSHOP SESSION

1. [17-162](#) FY17-18 BUDGET WORKSHOP
Staff Contact and Presenter: Vicki Rios, Director, Budget and Finance
Staff Presenter: Tom Duensing, Assistant City Manager
Staff Presenter: Terri Canada, Budget Administrator

Ms. Rios provided information on the changes in response times due to the low acuity units in the Fire Department. She also discussed EMS incident response projects for advanced life support and basic life support calls.

Councilmember Turner asked if the low acuity units had reduced response time for Station 151.

Chief Garrison said that was correct. The total decrease in response time for Station 151 was just over one minute. He explained the low acuity units had also had a great effect on the response times of the other units.

Councilmember Turner said the low acuity units were getting the firefighters to the calls quicker.

Chief Garrison said running the low acuity units helped put the appropriate unit on the call and allowed the closest unit to that emergency to service the customers.

Ms. Rios provided an overview of cost allocations. She discussed project chargebacks and how those charges related to a specific function or area.

Councilmember Clark wanted further explanation for the IT project chargebacks and indirect staff and administrative charges.

Ms. Rios said the IT project chargebacks were for new software implementation or new information technology projects. If the software was specific to a certain department, it would be budgeted in the IT budget, but charged back and would show up in that department's budget. She said some projects were charged to multiple areas.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked for an explanation of the large increases for technology

charges and the lower technology replacement budget.

Ms. Rios said that would be explained further in the presentation.

Ms. Rios said a portion of the indirect charges costs could be charged to the enterprise funds.

Councilmember Clark asked if indirect staff and administrative charges were charged to the enterprise fund exclusively.

Ms. Rios said the expenses were also charged to other funds, such as the transportation sales tax fund and HURF. The charges had increased by approximately \$300,000 because there were employees in the Finance Department who were being directly charged to the enterprise funds. It was reflected in this year's budget that the employees did work for other funds and not just that particular fund.

Councilmember Turner understood why the employees working across several funds needed to be allocated appropriately. He asked why the funds were not being allocated appropriately in other departments, as well.

Mr. Duensing explained that IT expenditures were budgeted as an internal service function. It was a good practice to allocate those costs based on some sort of methodology throughout the organization. He said if there was cash within the internal service funds, it might not be necessary to allocate the total budget adopted, because the allocation could be reduced if there was cash in the fund. It was a completely separate operation within the City, but was a way to allocate the cost.

Mr. Duensing said it would assist in determining the true costs in each area. If an internal service cost was going up because of an allocation change methodology or there was cash in the fund which offset what was needed to allocate, the budgets were adjusted up or down. If there was a doubling of the technology charge, the departments did not have to go back and cut services or cut operating budgets. He said some costs were incurred in the general fund and costs could be re-classified within the general fund. Mr. Duensing said internal services funds and allocating those funds was a GFOA best practice.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked why there was more than a 26% increase in the amount of money being collected.

Councilmember Clark asked if staff could note on a new line item the reason for the change when accounting changes were made in the future.

Councilmember Turner understood if the formula changed, the individual departments were held harmless for that change from one budget year to the next. He asked if individual department had any control over that charge, and if there was anything the departments could do to reduce the charge.

Mr. Duensing said if charges were reduced, departments could not use the funds for anything else. If the charges were increased, the departments did not have to decrease their operating expenses to cover the charges. It was just a way to allocate the cost of an internal service function to the appropriate areas to determine the estimated cost of providing the services.

Councilmember Turner asked if a department felt its allocation was higher than it should

be compared to other departments, was there anything the department could do about that. He also asked if a department wanted to reduce its allocation for the upcoming year, was there anything the department could do internally to reduce the amount of IT it was using to do that.

Mr. Duensing said the costs were dependent on the appropriation within the IT budget. If that appropriation went down, then costs could be reduced. The driver of the total costs was the appropriation within the internal service functions and if there was any cash in there that could offset the charges that were being incurred.

Ms. Rios said there were three charges allocated from the internal service fund for IT, which included technology charges, technology projects and telephones. Technology projects were like capital projects and frequently took more than one year to complete. In FY15 and FY16, there had been some cash that had accumulated in the IT fund and not as much had to be allocated in charges to the individual departments because of the available cash. The cash had now been used and the charges for FY18 were higher than in previous years.

Councilmember Clark asked if the charges were calculated per device or per person within the department.

Ms. Rios said the charges were calculated per device.

Councilmember Clark asked why carryover was already showing in the IT budget when other departments wouldn't have the carryover figures until the end of the budget process.

Ms. Rios said carryover wasn't permitted in other department budgets. It was allowed in the IT budget for technology projects, which were treated similarly to a capital project. Carryover had been calculated for all of the CIP projects, including the technology projects fund.

Councilmember Clark asked why staff was highlighting carryover in the budget when carryover in other departments had not been provided.

Ms. Rios said it was treated similarly to a CIP as these were multi-year projects and staff had the opportunity to calculate the carryover for this department. She said the CIP carryover was not ready at the time staff did the draft CIP, but it was ready now.

Ms. Rios said there were questions from the prior workshop about CDL costs. She said the cost of a CDL was \$75 and a specialized exam was required every two years. She said the cost of the program was approximately \$10,800 per year due to the number of CDL-licensed employees. She said those costs were not covered under the employee's medical insurance plan.

Councilmember Aldama asked if the Arizona Department of Transportation required the certifications.

Ms. Rios said that was correct.

Councilmember Aldama asked why the City paid \$10,800 instead of having the employee pay for the exam.

Mr. Brown said the benefit to the City was that the exams were very consistent in the way they were handled. He said the physicals were specific and detailed for CDL

certification and were required by federal and state law. There might not be doctors available to do the types of exams under the City's medical benefits plan. He said providing the exams for employees and keeping the standards consistent, gave the City less risk from an industrial standpoint.

Councilmember Aldama said a medical doctor could provide the same exact exam and it would save \$10,800.

Mr. Brown said using one provider provided a level of consistency and had been recommended by the City's Risk Manager. Using several doctors would provide a level of risk which might be an issue.

Councilmember Aldama said the Arizona Department of Transportation required a specific, detailed CDL certification, which did not vary by doctor's offices. He said the consistency was there and already set by ADOT. He said while the amount was not very high, it was still \$10,000 and staff might feel more comfortable going to their own doctor. He suggested staff look at the policy.

Councilmember Turner asked if employees were allowed a free physical exam and how often that was provided.

Mr. Brown said employees did receive standard annual physicals that were 100% covered as part of preventative health care.

Councilmember Turner agreed with Councilmember Aldama and asked if staff could look into employees using their own annual physicals to obtain their CDL certification, rather than the City spending \$10,000 to provide the service.

Mr. Brown would work with the risk manager and Blue Cross to look into it. He said the concern on the risk management side was providing consistency in the exams and reducing the level of risk.

Mayor Weiers said the City had to protect drivers and the public. He asked if the City could use the doctors that worked with the firefighters to perform the evaluations.

Mr. Brown said staff could look into the program to see if efficiencies could be found in the process. He said the current program also might avoid doctor shopping that could occur.

Councilmember Clark agreed with Councilmember Aldama and wanted to know what other processes were funded through Risk Management.

Councilmember Aldama agreed with Mayor Weiers' comments regarding the safety for the driver and for the public. ADOT wouldn't provide for regular doctors doing the exams if it didn't think the exams would be consistent.

Mayor Weiers had to have an FAA-approved doctor examine him for his pilot's license. His regular doctor could not do the exam. He said they were all on the same page and wanted to make sure there was consistency with less expense.

Mr. Phelps asked if Council was looking at a way to reduce costs to the City and transfer the cost of the CDL certification to the employee or was it about managing the program and the City continuing to fund the cost.

Councilmember Aldama said the questions were how to save costs and change the policy so employees had the opportunity to go to their own medical doctor. ADOT put out a list of qualified examiners that met the federal standards. He said staff might want to get employee input.

Councilmember Turner said it was about saving \$10,800 if the CDL certification belonged to the employee. The expense would not be transferred to the employee if it was something that was covered by insurance. He said it was not more expensive for the employee, but was a cost savings for the taxpayer.

Mayor Weiers asked if firefighters were required to have a CDL.

Mr. Brown said firefighters were not required to have a CDL.

Mayor Weiers asked if staff could find out how other cities handled the issue and if there was a chance the City would lose employees due to the potential burden.

Mr. Brown said staff would check with other cities. The ultimate goal was to protect employees and Glendale citizens and protect the City from risk.

Ms. Rios said another question that came up at a prior workshop was about the cost of the 13.5 position that were being added to the budget. She provided a slide showing the costs for the positions added to the general fund, the enterprise/HURF fund and the positions added for bed tax and Risk Management.

Ms. Rios provided the Budget and Finance mission statement. She said programs and functions for the Budget and Finance department included customer service, tax and licensing, accounting services, materials management, budget and research and finance administration.

Ms. Rios said approved supplementals for FY17 included a contract administrator.

Elizabeth Fernandez, the Contract Administrator, said one of her first priorities was working on audit findings and meeting with community partners on the larger agreements. She was working with Public Works on an inventory of the public assets and scheduling inspections regularly. She was also working with AEG on their capital improvement plan, which would come before Council in a few weeks. She would continue to focus on contract compliance and documentation.

Councilmember Aldama asked if the asset management included the Arena and Camelback Ranch.

Ms. Fernandez said Public Works had finished Camelback Ranch and she would continue to work with them on the inspections. She was working on a plan for the Arena and the Renaissance Hotel on the Exhibit Hall and the Conference Center later this year.

Councilmember Aldama asked if the report would be brought to the Council.

Ms. Fernandez said it would.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the capital needs at Camelback Ranch were being looked at.

Ms. Fernandez said that was correct.

Councilmember Turner asked if Ms. Fernandez would be working on providing Council more detail regarding the specifics of the Camelback Ranch contract and some of the other larger contracts.

Ms. Fernandez was assisting with some contracts regarding performance, but as far as legal obligations, she deferred to the City Attorney's Office.

Councilmember Aldama asked if the asset management for Camelback Ranch included assessing the condition of capital assets the City paid for and determining if those assets had reached the end of their useful life.

Ms. Fernandez said an asset tagging of the facility had been completed and it had yet to be determined how that would roll out to a capital improvement plan and inspections.

Councilmember Aldama asked if just the fixed assets had been completed.

Ms. Fernandez said that was correct.

Councilmember Aldama asked if Ms. Fernandez was creating a process to identify the full life of those assets, such as the scoreboard.

Ms. Fernandez said it was a new project she would be working on beginning this year.

Ms. Rios said Ms. Fernandez was not the expert in the life or condition of the assets but was putting the processes and procedures in place. She said Ms. Fernandez was working with Public Works who were knowledgeable about replacement schedules.

Mr. Phelps said there was an internal project to strengthen the asset management system. The system should know when was the right time to replace assets.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said that was important, but the Council approved a contract administrator to help it understand the complicated contracts and what the obligations were.

Mr. Bailey said Councilmember Tolmachoff was right, but staff needed to know what the alignment was of the projects that Ms. Fernandez had been working on. It was easy to read a contractual provision and understand what it said, but it was more difficult to tell the story behind that provision. He said understanding that would help the Council better understand how to fix the contractual problems.

Councilmember Aldama asked if that was what Ms. Fernandez was working on.

Mr. Bailey said Ms. Fernandez was part of an internal group that was trying to accomplish that.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said the City's responsibility was not for maintenance, but was for capital. She wanted to know if someone was making sure the proper maintenance was being done. She hoped that was part of the scope of what was happening in that position.

Councilmember Aldama asked how many sole source vendors and contracts the City had.

Ms. Rios said that information could be provided to Council as well as the number of vendors that had been approved over a period of time but wasn't sure if the contracts still existed. She would provide as much information as possible.

Ms. Rios said the only change requested in the FY18 budget was moving some funding for external audit services.

Councilmember Clark said the Budget and Finance Department had a decrease from FY16 to FY17 of 71% and asked if Arena events and the AZSTA stadium tax appeared somewhere else in the budget.

Ms. Rios said that budget was moved out of the Finance Department and moved into the non-departmental budget.

Councilmember Clark said the Budget and Finance Department had seen a 6.2% increase for the year.

Ms. Rios said the non-departmental budget was for items not related to a particular department, such as unemployment/long term disability insurance, TPT administration fees, arena management and City membership dues.

Councilmember Clark asked why three line items were created under professional and contractual in the section.

Ms. Rios explained the items were separated out so it was easier to remember what each of the items were. She said the \$5.6 million was the arena management agreement, the \$4.5 million was the AZSTA sales tax rebate, and the \$3 million was the Arizona Cardinals settlement.

Councilmember Clark asked about the \$50,000 line item.

Ms. Rios said the \$50,000 was for miscellaneous consulting fees for any initiative that might come up during the year.

Councilmember Clark asked about the six line items for memberships and subscriptions.

Ms. Rios said those line items included membership to the Maricopa Association of Governments, subscription to Westmarc, National League of Cities and League of Arizona Cities and Towns.

Councilmember Clark said the items called "obsolete inventory expenses" and "inventory adjustment" had been zeroed out. She asked if the items were somewhere else in the budget.

Ms. Rios said those were charges that occurred in one particular year but there was no budget for them now.

Councilmember Clark asked what the IT project chargeback of \$354,000 was for.

Ms. Rios said that was the total of all of the general fund projects and the primary project in that chargeback was for records management software for the Clerk's office.

Councilmember Clark asked if that was for the City Clerk's Office.

Ms. Rios said that was correct.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked for more detail of the \$3.4 million AZSTA sales tax rebate.

Ms. Rios said under the agreement with AZSTA, the City was contractually obligated to rebate all sales tax that was collected within the stadium and surrounding area, back to AZSTA. She said the amount was \$3.4 million last year, but usually ran higher than that. The estimate for next year was about \$4.5 million and was only the general fund portion of that sales tax. The City retained the transportation and safety sales tax.

Mr. Duensing said if the revenue budget for the sales tax revenue increased and they had to rebate more, it had zero impact on the general fund. He explained they City did have to budget for it because a check had to be written and staff had to budget on the revenue side, as well.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if it was because of the development agreement.

Mr. Duensing said it was because of the original development agreement, which stated any non-dedicated sales tax generated in the building and around the building were rebated to AZSTA.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if there was an expiration date to the rebate.

Mr. Bailey said the reimbursement ran in perpetuity with the existence of the stadium.

Councilmember Turner asked if the sales tax rebate in the agreement was related to parking, land purchases and external improvements in the agreement.

Mr. Bailey said that was correct.

Councilmember Malnar suggested supporting the Veteran's Success Center at Luke Air Force Base in the amount of \$70,000, which had not yet been budgeted. He provided several options for funding the contribution in the FY18 budget such as a delay in hiring several staff positions and in-kind donations in the amount of \$10,000, which would leave a balance due of \$17,000. Councilmember Malnar asked the Police and Fire Departments to come up with the balance of the funds by delaying some new item or employee. He believed the City could fund the contribution and asked Council for its input.

Councilmember Aldama was unable to speak about the item because he was employed with the Maricopa County Community College District and recused himself from discussion of the item.

Councilmember Tolmachoff thought it was a good idea but didn't support postponing hiring of the Council office staff member due to the office being so short-staffed. She said Council might be able to find some funds to address the issue as it moved through the budget process.

Councilmember Clark supported the City funding the Veterans Support Center at some level, as well as other valley cities contributing to the endowment fund. She also wanted assurance the Center was seeking grant funding opportunities and corporate sponsorships to fund the Center.

Mayor Weiers assured the Council that no stone had been unturned regarding alternative funding.

Councilmember Clark liked the concept, but was not sure what the amount should be. She said the Council had been short-staffed for a long time and did not agree with postponing hiring a staff person for four months.

Mayor Weiers liked the concept of supporting veterans, but had questions about exactly what was trying to be accomplished. Many service members transitioning out of the military at Luke Air Force Base might not be Glendale residents and would want to go back to their home states. He would like more information about the program and wanted to make sure that any veteran had access to all the services. In-kind donations could include Gus the Bus providing transportation. He was not sure if there was consensus right at the moment to move forward on the item.

Councilmember Turner said it was a worthy endeavor and he liked Councilmember Malnar's ideas about how to provide funding. He would like to see a placeholder in the budget.

Mr. Phelps said staff would do that. There was a need to develop an agreement with the organization and bring the item back to Council for a more detailed discussion and approval.

Ms. Rios said one additional item under non-department budget was a request from Westmarc for an increase to the City's contribution.

Mr. Stoddard said the City participated in Westmarc on a sponsorship level and currently provided a \$6,000 membership gold-level donation. He said Glendale was asked to move to the premier partner level, which was a \$10,000 donation. The benefits of moving from a gold to a premier partner level included a free Best of the West table, which was a \$1,700 benefit. He said the Westmarc offices had relocated from Peoria to a Westgate location.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if Ms. Hoffman was present.

Mr. Stoddard said she was not present.

Councilmember Aldama would have preferred to see the request in a workshop.

Mayor Weiers said Council would like to put a placeholder in the budget for now and hear the item at a workshop and hear from Ms. Hoffman.

Mr. Stoddard said a placeholder would be inserted for the platinum level membership and the item scheduled for a workshop.

Ms. Rios introduced Mr. Strunk for the Public Facility, Recreation and Special Events budget.

Councilmember Aldama said not all parks were maintained equally in the City. He asked how the cost of \$2,500 per acre for park maintenance was calculated.

Mr. Strunk said that figure came from the parks maintenance budget divided into the number of park acres in the City. He said some parks were maintained differently based on the amenities.

Councilmember Aldama asked if it was a cost per standard and not a cost per data figure.

Mr. Strunk said it was one of many indicators used to budget the department costs.

Councilmember Aldama asked if the actual cost to maintain the parks would be the same \$2,500 figure.

Mr. Strunk did not have that specific information but could provide information regarding water use and hourly records.

Councilmember Aldama said some community centers were operated by nonprofit operators and others, such as Foothills Recreation Center, operated with City staff. He said it looked like staff was favoring one center over the others. He said although it was great to have nonprofit partners, they were not looking at things equally.

Councilmember Turner asked if the \$2,500 cost per acre for maintenance was below the national standard. He also wanted to know if that standard was the same for all parks across the country or if it was broken down by regions of the country.

Mr. Strunk said the national standard was \$2,731 per acre. He was not sure if that figure was reflective of what was spent in other valley cities.

Councilmember Turner wanted to know if that national standard was broken down by regions as there might be regional variations of what the cost would be.

Councilmember Turner asked how many park acres they were talking about.

Mr. Strunk said the City had 2,100 park acres.

Councilmember Aldama asked if the \$5 million in the budget was for park maintenance or did that figure have other costs combined with it.

Mr. Strunk said that was the figure used for the cost per acre and said it was used to budget.

Mr. Strunk said about 350,000 people attended the six special events hosted by the City. This was broken down to about \$19 per person that was spent in the downtown festivals. Staff felt comfortable it would meet revenue and sponsorship goals for the year. He said they had over \$300,000 in earned media for the large, high-profile events.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked about shifting the focus to citywide advertising, rather than just focusing on the downtown area, and asked if there was any data on where they were getting the best return on the advertising dollar.

Mr. Strunk said CVB staff had requested to hire On Advertising, who would assist in getting those metrics. They needed to be able to show how much of a return on investment was received for every dollar spent. Council should start receiving reports on a monthly basis.

Councilmember Aldama agreed the focus needed to be on all businesses in Glendale but said the downtown dynamics were much different than other areas of the City. He asked if there was going to be a different matrix on the downtown businesses.

Mr. Phelps said this was part of a shift in strategy to address the more unique nature of the merchants. He said the CVB would have different metrics coming in and a new merchant's manager would be able to focus specific priorities to the core downtown area. Councilmember Clark said Mr. Phelps' comments about the CVB were correct. It was not the CVB's mission to promote only the downtown but to promote the entire city.

Mr. Strunk clarified that the ad placements would be citywide and not just downtown. He said the metrics received from On Advertising would show what they were talking about.

Mr. Phelps said the 10% rate in convention bookings was a very aggressive number. He said they were doing well in the occupancy rate and the daily rate and would put the City in the position of attracting hotel developers.

Councilmember Clark said another issue was who they promoted in downtown and asked if the CVB was addressing the issue of promoting businesses that were not usually included in promotional advertising.

Mr. Strunk said the CVB was always open to partnering with any of the downtown merchants. They looked to the resources available so they didn't limit the creation and support of events in that fashion.

Councilmember Clark understood when a group of merchants came to the City with an idea for a downtown event, the City was going to cooperate. She was talking about promoting everyone, not just a select group of merchants. It was important to be inclusive rather than exclusive with the merchants.

Mr. Strunk said there was a membership component to the CVB.

Councilmember Turner said there didn't seem to be anything in the budget documents that discussed the CVB in detail.

Mr. Phelps said the Councilmembers were discussing economic development strategies, the CVB and special events. He was scheduling a more detailed presentation about these areas after the summer break.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said the membership aspect of the CVB was a problem and she did not support it. The \$30,000 in membership created an exclusive club for a taxpayer endeavor and created promotional responsibilities outside of Glendale. The money would be better spent by taking the bed tax and focusing on Glendale and breaking up the exclusive club. She said the memberships should stop on July 1st.

Councilmember Turner also had concerns about the memberships. He said although \$30,000 was the target, \$8,000 was the actual figure. The budget for the CVB was \$700,000 and the community feedback was that the small membership was driving the focus. He would rather see figures that were number-based and would like to see current figures as well as the target figures. Councilmember Turner said the focus seemed to be on visitors and not enough on tourists, conventions and conferences.

Mr. Strunk said they would translate the percentages into actual numbers and would come back with a more detailed discussion about the CVB.

Councilmember Aldama agreed with ending the membership and asked who tracked that data and what did members get out of the membership. He said another reason to end the membership requirement was that many businesses could not afford to be a member

and might feel left out. There were many great events that were held downtown and he would like to see all the businesses have an opportunity to partner with the CVB. Councilmember Aldama asked the CVB to start partnering with local businesses across the board.

Councilmember Aldama had read Ms. Zomok's title as being CEO. He asked what was her correct title.

Mr. Strunk said Lorraine Zomok was the Administrator of the CVB.

Councilmember Aldama had seen Ms. Zomok's title listed as CEO in publications and wanted to make it clear that CEO was not a title that the City currently had.

Councilmember Clark said the Council was looking for a philosophical change regarding how the CVB operated, what its goals were and how well it served the entire merchant community in downtown and other parts of the City.

Ms. Zomok said at the time the membership fee was implemented, it was best practice for CVBs to have a membership component. She said the membership fees were approved by the Council and they generated revenue. The CVB had been around since October of 2000 when the downtown area was the driving force for the CVB because there was no sports and entertainment district at that time.

Ms. Zomok said the CVB has had a very aggressive advertising campaign for the past couple of years and was not just advertising downtown. It was a destination branding organization and promoted Glendale as a whole.

Councilmember Turner said the Visitor Center was targeted toward the tourist. He asked what was being done to market the CVB.

Ms. Zomok said they had met with the city manager who had put them on a new strategic plan for global sales, or putting heads in beds, which included conferences, meetings and events.

Councilmember Turner asked how many heads in beds, conferences and events were being held.

Ms. Zomok said about 18% of business was conferences and related events, with the rest being leisure travel. She said their major focus was global sales and increasing hotel traffic to Glendale. The 65% increase was directly related to the relationships they were building and advertising.

Mr. Strunk said Parks and Recreation had received a total of \$205,000 in supplemental requests, which included a parks maintenance increase for landscaping maintenance, recreation administration and special events, and wi-fi access at the community and recreation centers. He said they were asking for money budgeted to change a contractual position for a national sales manager to a permanent FTE. The funds for the position would come out of Tohono O'odham funds that were negotiated to be used for the CVB. They would also move a digital content program employee up using the same funds.

Mr. Strunk said there was fund balance in the CVB bed tax and they would like to start a pilot program where an organization would receive a monetary award if it could prove it was putting heads in beds.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said the CVB had a \$240,000 marketing budget and about \$105,000 was going to be dedicated to the contract with On Advertising, which would free people up for other work. She was confused why they would need to hire someone for digital content when they were freeing up staff time with the On Advertising contract. She did not support bringing in another staff person. She asked how trade show and travel dollars were tracked and what the City was getting by attending the events.

Mr. Strunk said regarding the On Advertising question, there was approximately \$300,000 to spend down. He said \$200,000 was earmarked for the CVB and the balance of expenditures would occur in the Parks and Recreation Division, Civic Center and for special events. Staff was going to work with On Advertising to develop a singular message. He said the travel budget was in one of the professional and contractual line items.

Ms. Zomok said the travel budget was out of the 1.6% bed tax and was absorbed into the professional and contractual.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked where that could be found in the budget book. She watched the last meeting and thought the CVBs contribution amount was \$105,000 for the On Advertising contract. She said that the contract was supposed to free up staff time and asked why didn't they devote that staff time to the digital content position they were asking for.

Ms. Zomok said that position was already at the CVB, but it was a contractual position and they were asking for that position to have FTE status.

Mr. Strunk said currently the position that oversaw the function that On Advertising was going to provide worked up to 60 hours a week and was responsible for placing and overseeing the ads. The digital content position was not at the same level. He provided the page number in the budget book where the professional and contractual information was located and said that figure included all the media components as well as travel expenses.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the marketing budget was included.

Mr. Strunk said that was where the marketing budget would come from.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said that left about \$116,000 for travel and trade shows.

Mr. Strunk said there were other programs and services that used the funds.

Ms. Zomok said that overall number reflected the branding, marketing and promotion they did, which included research, data reports, advertising, travel and operation of the Visitor's Center and CVB.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked how much of that budget was used for travel and trade shows.

Ms. Zomok said approximately 10% of that budget.

Councilmember Clark said the digital content program manager and the pilot program are

all related to the future discussion of the CVB, and suggested granting the items placeholder status and delay a final decision until the workshop discussion about the CVB.

Councilmember Turner asked if the actual budget for the CVB was about \$700,000, and asked if the rest of the money was accounted for on a different page.

Councilmember Turner asked how many employees worked at the CVB.

Mr. Strunk said there were 4 FTE positions total and 1.5 of those positions were being requested in the budget process.

Councilmember Clark asked if the figures for convention, media and parking division had moved to some other location in the budget book.

Mr. Strunk said he would have to work with the budget team to find out where those figures went.

Councilmember Clark said she would like to know where those figures went. She asked for further explanation for two line items, Parks and Recreation Administration and Recreation Administration and Events.

Mr. Strunk said, during the reorganization, the department component was erroneously placed into a different budget division. He said it was always in the budget, but was incorrectly assigned to a different department.

Councilmember Clark asked about Recreation Administration and Events.

Mr. Strunk said it had always been in the department. He explained with the department reorganization, there was Parks Administration and Parks Facilities, the title represented the recreation side of the management team.

Councilmember Clark asked if it was necessary to have two sets of administration staff for Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Strunk said the intent was to be able to track by area of function.

Councilmember Clark was not sure that was a good use of taxpayer dollars and said she would have further discussion with Mr. Strunk.

Councilmember Aldama said there had been several different dollar amounts for the CVB and asked if there could be a detail page dedicated to the CVB.

Ms. Rios said she would work with staff to present the information differently. Moving the items around impacted their ability to compare items from year to year. It was something they would continue to review.

Councilmember Aldama said it would make it much easier for the public, as well. He asked what role the CVB played in a fundraiser for the Treasure House and wanted to know why the CVB was hosting the Leadership West Conference and how it benefited the City.

Mr. Strunk said the CVB worked with an advisory group which provided feedback and one of the group members wanted to help a local nonprofit. It was really being driven out of

the University of Phoenix Stadium community outreach and was something that the focus group wanted to pursue. He said it would be held at the University of Phoenix Stadium and there was no staffing, money or anything that the taxpayers were paying for.

Councilmember Aldama would like to hear about the Leadership West event but didn't understand how the CVB played a role in the events. He asked if the CVB had always intended to play a role in those types of events.

Ms. Zomok said it was an initiative that came out of the hotel and venue advisory committee. The committee saw the camaraderie in Glendale for giving and wanted to find a bigger way to do that. She said no City dollars were involved in the event and they were lending promotional assistance to the City in the summer. An increase in hotel reservations was anticipated with the event. It was a good thing to do with major partners in the west valley and it would drive business to the stadium at a very hot time of year. She said Leadership West looked to align with the City and they have worked with them for many years.

Councilmember Aldama said there was a cost to the event in staff time. He asked how they tracked the data that they might get more heads in beds by participating in this type of event.

Ms. Zomok said they would look at hotel occupancy figures at the end of the month, as well as through the west valley package they were putting together.

Councilmember Aldama asked if there would be a discounted rate for being a part of that event.

Ms. Zomok said there would.

Councilmember Turner said the parks maintenance budget had increased in the last couple of years, but it was still lower than the national standard. If the budget was increased up to the national standard, it might solve many of the park maintenance problems. He wanted to get more money into the parks maintenance budget and be prepared to cover any unforeseen expenses.

Mr. Strunk said they did receive about \$480,000 in additional water money about 4 or 5 years ago. He said many of the costs were locked in, but they would continue to work with the City Manager's Office.

Councilmember Aldama said the homeless population had increased in the downtown area over the last several months. He asked staff to look into getting HUD matching funds, as well as a dedicated budget program to address homelessness.

Councilmember Clark said Councilmember Aldama's comments should be the subject of a Council item of special interest. She did not think it was appropriate for direction to be given for it to be looked into, until the item had been introduced to the entire Council and Council give further direction on the issue.

Councilmember Aldama agreed, but said there were two other items that were discussed today that did not have to go through a Council item of special interest process to request funding for programs. He said those items were the veteran's initiative and the parks and recreation item from Councilmember Turner. He said all items should be routed through the same process.

Councilmember Clark thought Councilmember Malnar's item and the other item would be brought back to a future workshop for discussion and assumed Councilmember Aldama's item would come back for future workshop discussion as well.

Councilmember Aldama asked Mayor Weiers for direction on how the items would be handled.

Mayor Weiers said if Council was discussing a budget item and it needed more clarification, it would come back for more discussion. He said Councilmember Aldama's item was not part of the budget discussion but it was an issue that needed further discussion.

Councilmember Aldama agreed and said both the homeless item and the veteran's item would be Council items of special interest and he was agreeable to that, but he would like to get clarification.

Mr. Phelps had understood that Council would like to have staff look for a placeholder in the budget that would fund the first year of Councilmember Malnar's item. He also heard the same for the Westmarc item. If Council directed staff to try and come up with resources, they would need to make sure there was general consensus. He said Councilmember Aldama's item was a little different because he did not have a specific amount. Mr. Phelps was not sure about Councilmember Turner's item and asked for clarification.

Councilmember Aldama was not prepared to give a dollar amount because he had not done that much research. He asked if there was consensus for his request.

Mayor Weiers asked if there was consensus to move the homelessness issue to a workshop. There was consensus to move the item to a workshop.

Councilmember Turner posed the question of putting more money into parks maintenance. He had asked staff to come up with more money and threw out a figure of \$100,000.

Mr. Phelps said staff could identify \$100,000, but asked for direction on where cuts might have to take place to offset that amount, if revenue assumptions should be increased in the model, or program elimination or reduction. He said those were policy decisions that needed to come from Council, unless Council requested staff to make the decisions.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said staff was proposing to change to a new vender and there would be an increase in costs. She said the vendor might also be held to a higher standard. She suggested giving the new vender an opportunity to see if it could do a better job.

Mr. Strunk said department was very specific in its level of expectation when the bid was awarded, but the current vendor was not performing to staff's expectations. He said the new vendor would fill the requirements of the specifications. He said there was money in the existing budget and suggested moving forward with the new contract to see how the new vendor performed.

Mayor Weiers said they could review the issue in six months and provide a supplemental at that time, if necessary.

Mr. Friedman presented the Economic Development budget. He said FY17 approved

supplementals included a one-time request for potential participation with ACA and/or GPEC in a Visiting CEO Forum, as well as ongoing trade show participation and professional education for a Certified Economic Developer credential.

Mr. Friedman said FY18 requested supplementals included a request for a downtown manager to assist in creating a vibrant city center as well as a diverse, cohesive and unified strategic plan for Historic Downtown Glendale.

Councilmember Clark asked how the department was spending the \$124,000 budgeted for membership and subscriptions.

Mr. Friedman said \$104,000 was for the annual GPEC membership.

Councilmember Clark asked if that was charged to the Economic Development Department.

Mr. Friedman said it was. He said there was also a \$20,000 membership with the Glendale Chamber of Commerce.

Councilmember Malnar liked the idea of a downtown manager and said it would be a great opportunity to grow downtown Glendale.

Mr. Stoddard presented the said this was his department's first full fiscal year after being reorganized last July. He said his department has two divisions, Public Affairs Administration and the Cable Communications Division. He also spoke about the reductions for FY18 in the operating budget.

Councilmember Clark asked why the Media Center Operations budget had been zeroed out and asked what happened to the funding for the Glendale Connection.

Mr. Stoddard presented the Public Affairs budget. He said with the department's reorganization, the Glendale Connection item had been consolidated into Community Activities.

Councilmember Clark asked why there were two separate Communications line items.

Ms. Rios explained that was internal movement of funds.

Mr. Duensing said he was presenting the Mayor's budget and the Council budget. He said they were requesting one additional FTE in the Council office and restoring the Mayor's funding for his FTEs. He said the one FTE request would bring the total FTEs in the Council Office to 6 employees. He said they were working through the process to see how those positions would be structured.

Mr. Duensing said it was their intent to include \$10,000 assistance for the volunteer program in the Neighborhood Services. He requested continuation of the funding for that program.

Councilmember Clark asked if there were currently five FTEs in the Council Office.

Mr. Duensing said that was correct.

Councilmember Clark asked if the communications project manager position was filled.

Mr. Duensing said the communications project manager position had been filled.

Ms. Sliva said that position had been filled.

Councilmember Clark asked if the five positions had all been filled.

Mr. Duensing said there was currently one position on loan, so Council was receiving support but not all of the positions had been filled.

Councilmember Clark asked what the Council office was receiving for the \$28,044 technology charge, per device.

Mr. Duensing said there were five FTEs and it was an allocation of the technology that they had.

Councilmember Clark asked what difference it made if they had five people in the office if the charges were made per device.

Mr. Duensing said he misspoke and it was devices.

Councilmember Clark said that was what she was interested in knowing. She said it seemed like an exorbitant amount of money for the devices the Council Office had and used.

Ms. Rios said staff could get the detail regarding the number of devices, what those devices were and the charges.

Mayor Weiers recessed the meeting for lunch.

Mayor Weiers resumed the meeting.

Mr. Murphy presented the IT Department budget. He said there were four funds in the department, which included the information and technology fund, telephone fund, technology replacement fund and technology projects fund. He said 3 FTEs were approved in FY17 for the IT Department. Those positions included an IT Manager, an IT Project Manager (Information Security Officer), as well as a Data Architect.

Councilmember Clark asked how many departments in the City now employed their own IT support.

Mr. Murphy asked for clarification of the question.

Councilmember Clark said she was asking about departments paying for outside support for software that was specific to their department.

Mr. Murphy said, generally, if there was a technical issue, IT staff would get on the phone with the software company for support. He said there were other applications where the City paid for support and staff would call the vendor directly to discuss an issue or problem they were having.

Councilmember Clark asked if training was provided to each employee who would be using a particular software and where that training was located in the budget documents.

Mr. Murphy said IT did not have a budget area for training.

Ms. Rios said the City used a train the trainer type of business model and the in-house subject matter experts would train the new employee. She said if additional training was needed, a department might use its local travel money to attend local training in that software.

Councilmember Clark asked about several line items and asked if those items had been moved somewhere else in the budget.

Ms. Rios said some of the items in technology replacement were not actual replacements, so they were moved to another section of the budget.

Councilmember Clark asked about several other items that had been zeroed out.

Mr. Murphy said those items were in the project equipment fund and there were no equipment items specified in those projects.

Ms. Rios said if there was a budget for the project, but it included warranties or line supplies, it was charged there. She said the budget was not there, but some of the project costs were broken down further. She said the total amount of the project did not change, but the total distribution between the line items might have changed.

Councilmember Clark asked how many devices the Council Office technology fund supported and what were they getting for that amount.

Mr. Murphy said there might be a misunderstanding about what that amount covered. He said IT tracked devices for every department. He said software, switches, routers and firewalls, maintenance costs and software costs were included in the fee.

Councilmember Clark asked how much Microsoft Office cost.

Mr. Murphy said the City had an agreement with Microsoft Office, which was renewed every three years. He said the cost was about \$500,000 per year.

Councilmember Clark said the Council Office IT costs paid for their share of the cost of Microsoft Office and any equipment and maintenance that made their equipment run.

Mr. Murphy said that was correct.

Mr. Duensing said the charges for IT were allocated both on FTEs and devices. He said the Council Office had 20 devices, divided between the 11 FTEs. He said operating costs were based on the number of FTEs throughout the City and the technology replacement was based on devices maintained in each area.

Councilmember Turner would like to see a higher goal of customer satisfaction than 80%.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked about how the technology costs were spread out to the departments.

Ms. Rios said telephones were also allocated out. She said technology projects were allocated differently. Some projects might only be allocated to one department.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked how technology charges were divided per employee.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said she was confused as to why the amounts were so much

higher this year than last year.

Ms. Rios said last year they had available fund balance in the IT fund so departments were not charged as much. This year, there was no available fund balance, so the departments were charged the entire amount in technology charges. She also explained there were additional costs such as FTEs that made the costs higher.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said there were several pieces of equipment she did not use. She asked if those devices should be turned back in to IT.

Mr. Murphy said IT sent out an asset inventory report every year and requested departments return equipment they were not using.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if there was a cost savings to the department if it turned in unused equipment.

Mr. Murphy said those items would come off the inventory report and would eventually reflect in the allocation.

Councilmember Aldama asked if laptops and desktop computer were included in technology replacement.

Mr. Murphy said that was correct.

Councilmember Aldama asked if the warranties for that equipment expired while it was on the shelf or while it was in use.

Mr. Murphy said they focused the purchases so as soon as those items came in, they could be used, because the warranty clock started right away.

Councilmember Aldama wanted everyone to know that the warranty for equipment began the day of purchase.

Mr. Murphy said they knew how many devices were due to be replaced and how many could be replaced. IT scheduled purchases to coincide with those dates so equipment would be installed in less than a week from the day it was received.

Mr. Murphy told Councilmember Turner that the highest customer service rating was the goal for his staff. He said those were just the initial metrics, but they wanted to achieve the highest rating possible for the services provided.

Ms. Handlong introduced the City Manager's Office budget. She said the budget was over \$800,000 and had 5 FTEs. The budget had decreased 8% due to office restructuring.

Mr. Phelps provided information on the core projects and initiatives that the City Manager's office handled. He said they were working through the strategic initiatives process, What Works Cities, an Open Data program as well as developing a LEAN Academy. They were also looking at their asset management system and trying to refine the depth of that program.

Mr. Duensing said they were adopting the balanced scorecard strategic planning process. He said measures drove performance in organizations, and they needed to measure progress. They were trying to make those measures more performance-based.

Councilmember Clark highlighted that the City Manager's Department had deliberately decreased its budget by 8.15%. The department was setting a standard and sending a signal to other departments.

Councilmember Clark said the cell phone charges were gone.

Ms. Handlong provided information where those charges could be found.

Ms. Bower presented the City Clerk's Office budget. She said the FY17 approved supplementals included a request for funds to conduct the 2016 election and transfer of a senior management assistant to the City Clerk's Office.

Ms. Bower said the FY18 supplemental requests included funding for enterprise content management software. The cost included software and software support, installation, documentation and training, project management services, vendor hosting and cloud storage and conversion of 3.5 million existing records. There would be very little impact on the IT department because the system would be hosted in the cloud.

Ms. Bower provided information on the cost savings for the system. With the return on investment in staff time savings, the system would pay for itself in about 7 years. She said it would increase efficiency and improve transparency for the public.

Councilmember Malnar liked the statistics presented that the new system would pay for itself in 7 years. He said it provided the citizens with assurances that the City was making good investments. He supported implementing the new system.

Mr. Johnson presented the Water Services budget. He said in 2017, 3 FTEs were added to Water Services and 2 of those employees were already funded through the water sewer fund. He said there were 4 water treatment plants, 2 wastewater reclamation plants and the City was an owner in the 91st Avenue wastewater treatment plant owned by Phoenix.

Councilmember Aldama asked how many of the water meters were read remotely.

Mr. Johnson said 2,000 of the meters were read automatically and those were placed in the most unsafe areas of the City or where the meters were hard to access.

Councilmember Aldama asked how many total water meters were there in the City.

Mr. Johnson said there were 62,000 meters.

Councilmember Aldama asked if there were any plans of going to automatic meter reading in residential areas and asked if that would require a reduction in staff.

Mr. Johnson said the department had started looking at that, but was focused on the return on investment. It would cost millions of dollars to move to a fully automatic system.

Councilmember Aldama asked if there was also a risk management component to that process.

Mr. Johnson said that was correct. His employees faced danger every day.

Councilmember Aldama appreciated the men and women who did that job every day.

Mr. Johnson said the FY18 operating budget requested supplementals included \$184,000 for overtime and employee-related costs, which had increased due to a change in the holiday policy.

Councilmember Clark asked why the professional development budget had doubled.

Mr. Johnson said the state now required renewal fees for state certification licenses.

Councilmember Clark asked why the bank fees had been reduced.

Ms. Rios said reductions had been made in bank fees due to a change to the type of fee and how the City was classified with the bank.

Councilmember Clark said the budget item equipment less than \$5,000 per unit had doubled and asked what types of equipment the department obtained.

Mr. Johnson said various items of office and safety equipment needed to be replaced.

Councilmember Clark said chemical costs were down for the Arrowhead Water Retention Division.

Mr. Johnson said they had been doing their homework and were saving money on a new contract. A centralized process control manager had been holding down the costs for the items.

Councilmember Clark asked what the big expense was at WAWRF for building maintenance and repair.

Mr. Johnson said the costs included routine maintenance and HVAC work, plumbing work and fire suppression improvements.

Councilmember Clark said the customer service in the field budget had gone down and asked if that reflected the loss of a customer service position. She asked why they reduced the effectiveness of their customer service in the field. Was the budget decrease attributed to the loss of a position.

Mr. Johnson said the FTEs had not changed, but they had been rotating personnel and getting them on board. He said they hired temporaries to do that and there was a lesser cost for that.

Councilmember Clark asked what caused the big increase in the water distribution division.

Mr. Johnson said they had merged the meter maintenance group with the water distribution group to make sure they all were meeting the requirements for their job descriptions.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked about the IT project chargeback.

Mr. Johnson said they were replacing some of their SCADA remote equipment.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if that was being charged by IT.

Ms. Rios said it was an IT project that was budgeted in the IT budget, but was related to SCADA and specific to the Water Services Department, so it was being charged back to Water Services.

Mr. Friedline presented the Public Works budget. He said the Public Works department was made up of three divisions and the largest cost was the operating budget, which included contract services. He said the pavement management program was a 5 to 7-year project and staff would move as quickly as possible to improve the streets.

Mr. Beard discussed the Engineering division of Public Works. He said approved supplementals for FY17 included a recruitment for a FTE. The FY18 request included 7 FTEs, including two engineer positions which were not built into the FY18 budget. He said an engineering project manager would also be added as well as a real estate coordinator consultant.

Ms. Woytenko said the Field Operations FY17 budget supplementals included one FTE to increase reliability and reduce the contract. They were able to get the person on board quickly and there was approximately a \$35,000 savings in hiring the position.

Ms. Woytenko said they were asking for recycling containers in the FY18 budget to replace containers that were worn, cracked and broken. She said they were also asking for an account specialist lead to assist with the new scale at the landfill. The position would cut the wait time significantly.

Mr. Ebersole said Transportation budget supplementals for FY17 included a transportation planner who was taking over a large amount of work that was generally outsourced. He said two service workers and a dump truck were also brought on board which was assisting with the pavement management program and in-house concrete repair projects, which saved money for the City.

Mr. Ebersole said FY18 supplementals included 1 FTE as a signs and markings supervisor, who would assist with implementing striping and sign installation programs.

Councilmember Clark asked with all the new pavement projects, wouldn't a crewmember be more beneficial than hiring a supervisor.

Mr. Ebersole said it was a working supervisor position.

Mr. Ebersole said a tractor was being purchased, which would be a cost savings for the City. He explained the audit fees were for the GO audit which was done every three years. There were costs for the fixed-route contract, traffic mitigation operational budget increase, and radios and tablets for street crews.

Councilmember Aldama asked for an explanation why the City could not advertise on some of the signs.

Mr. Ebersole said the dynamic message signs were purchased with federal funds and they were restricted on what could be put on the signs. He said the messages had to be traffic-related.

Councilmember Aldama hoped the viewing public understood why the City could not advertise on the signs.

Councilmember Clark asked about the decrease in the Fiesta Bowl Division professional

and contractual expenses.

Mr. Ebersole said that item was for the Final Four fees and costs.

Councilmember Clark asked why it was under Fiesta Bowl.

Mr. Ebersole said that was the general fund budget it was allocated to.

Councilmember Clark said that was the account the Fiesta Bowl and Final Four was under.

Councilmember Clark asked about the increase in the budget for the Transportation Operations Division.

Mr. Ebersole said that was contract obligations regarding the agreement for parking. He said it used to be in the stadium operations fund and had been moved to the arena fund.

Councilmember Clark requested better explanations for the items.

Councilmember Clark asked about graffiti removal and graffiti removal right-of-way division charges. She said one was funded by the general fund and the other was funded by HURF. She said there was no change in the budget allocation for either one, but she had heard graffiti had been increasing. She asked if there was any provision to increase the amount should it be necessary.

Mr. Ebersole said the graffiti removal had been on track and they were not forecasting additional needs. Graffiti incidents fluctuated between 10,000 and 13,000 per year.

Councilmember Clark asked if the HURF-funded traffic studies division handled speed humps.

Mr. Ebersole said that was correct.

Councilmember Clark asked how many speed hump requests were they able to complete during a fiscal year.

Mr. Ebersole said there were several speed humps designated for replacement to the new style. He said he did not know how many they were going to complete this year.

Councilmember Clark asked if there was a waiting list for new speed humps and how many were they able to fulfill each year.

Mr. Ebersole said they could take as many requests that might come in. He said for each request, they had to perform a study, perform community outreach, go through the petition process and see if speed humps were warranted.

Councilmember Clark asked if they had a waiting list.

Mr. Ebersole said they did not have a waiting list.

Councilmember Clark asked if they had received any requests for speed humps in the past fiscal year.

Mr. Ebersole said yes.

Councilmember Clark asked if those requests were fulfilled within the fiscal year.

Mr. Ebersole said the studies were fulfilled.

Councilmember Clark asked if the physical work was completed, as well.

Mr. Ebersole said it was more complicated than that, and just because a speed hump was requested did not mean a speed hump would go in because it might not be warranted. He said once a request was received, a study had to be conducted to identify the speed of the vehicles, the congestion and count of the vehicles, and if the request met that criteria, a petition process was done.

Councilmember Clark asked if any speed humps were installed as a result of the completion of any studies.

Mr. Beard said 26 speed humps were installed that were on a previous waiting list.

Councilmember Clark asked if there was a waiting list right now.

Mr. Ebersole was not aware of the waiting list and thought all requests had been fulfilled.

Councilmember Clark asked what was in the transportation mitigation division budget.

Mr. Ebersole said traffic mitigation worked with the general engineering consultant to do counts after receiving resident requests for speed humps.

Councilmember Clark said that was all under the traffic studies division right now.

Mr. Ebersole said in the mitigation division, they had an engineering consultant that would help them with studies so they could move forward with programs such as the flashing yellow intersections.

Councilmember Clark asked what else was being done in the department.

Mr. Ebersole said there were traffic counts.

Councilmember Clark said they were not doing traffic counts for the speed humps as those were being done under the traffic studies division.

Ms. Rios said the traffic studies information Councilmember Clark was referring to had already been moved into the traffic mitigation division.

Councilmember Clark said that clarified her question.

Ms. Rios said that concluded the departmental presentations. She said staff would follow-up on several items, including the CIP, and would wrap up at the next meeting.

Mayor Weiers thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the budget workshop meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

City Council adjourned at 3:27 p.m.